



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,214	08/26/2003	Bradley Jacob	5074A-000001/COB	6133
27572 7590 01/23/2008 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			EXAMINER MEHTA, PARIKHA SOLANKI	
			ART UNIT 3737	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/23/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/649,214	JASCOB ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Parikha S. Mehta	3737	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Parikha S. Mehta. (3) _____

(2) Michael Taylor. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 18 January 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 27-50.


Identification of prior art discussed: Kienzle and Munger.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


BRIAN L. CASLER
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant suggested that Kienzle and Munger both provide shielding of the imager for a different reason than the one relied upon in the instant invention. Specifically, Applicant contends that the reference shields are provided to protect the imaging system from distortion caused by local magnetic fields such as those caused by navigation coils. In contrast, the instant claims provide a shield that is effective to protect the navigation coils from distortion caused by the imager. Examiner maintains that the purpose of the shield has no bearing on whether the reference shields teach the claimed shield; it is presumed that the materials used by the reference are effective to provide a two-way barrier, and as such the reference system would simultaneously function to shield the coils from the imager and vice versa. Examiner encourages Applicant to pursue amendments that would structurally, not functionally, distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in order to overcome the Kienzle and Munger references..